

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are allowable. Claims 12, 22, and 25-29 were previously cancelled. Claim 13 is amended herein. Claims remaining in the instant case are Claims 1-11, 13-21 and 23-24. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that Claims 1-11 are allowable.

### 102(b) Rejection

Claims 13-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang (US 6,390,855 B1). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claim 13 as amended herein is not anticipated by Chang and that Claims 14 and 16, as they depend from Claim 13 as amended herein and recite additional features of the present claimed invention, are not anticipated by Chang.

Independent Claim 13 has been amended herein to recite that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

A device comprising:  
circuitry for coupling said device to personal digital assistant; and  
circuitry for performing a function synergistically with a function performed by said personal digital assistant;  
wherein said device is sized and shaped to serve as a cover for an expansion card port, wherein said device fits into an opening in a housing of said personal digital assistant, wherein said device resides within the volume of said housing and performs a first function of enclosing said opening and performs a second function synergistically with said function performed by said personal digital assistant. (Emphasis Added)

Claims 14 and 16 depend from Claim 13 as amended herein and recite additional features of the present claimed invention.

On page 2 of the instant rejection, the rejection states that Chang teaches “a device comprising: Circuitry for coupling....Wherein said device is sized and shaped to serve as a cover for a expansion card port in a housing...” However, Applicants respectfully submit that Chang does not show or suggest a “device that is sized and shaped to serve as a cover for an expansion card port and fits into an opening of said personal digital assistant, wherein said device resides within the volume of said housing...” as claimed. Chang does not teach or suggest a device that resides within the volume of a personal digital assistant. Applicants respectfully assert that there is no basis for concluding that the device of Chang, or any of the other elements of Chang, use an expansion card port and cover in the manner of the present invention; specifically, in a device as recited in independent Claim 13 as amended herein. Applicants further submit that Chang does not teach or suggest the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 14, and 16 that are dependent on Claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 13, 14, and 16 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

### 103 Rejection

Claims 15, 17-19 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Ditzik (US Patent No. 5,983,073). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 15, 17-19 and 23-24 is not anticipated nor rendered

obvious by Cargin in view of Ditzik, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Chang in view of Ditzik.

Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants thus respectfully re-assert that, as amended herein, Claim 13 incorporates subject matter including a device comprising circuitry for coupling said device to a personal digital assistant, and circuitry for performing a function synergistically with a function performed by said personal digital assistant; wherein said device is sized and shaped to serve as a cover for an expansion card port, wherein said device fits into an opening in a housing of said personal digital assistant, wherein said device resides within the volume of said housing and performs a first function of enclosing said opening and performs a second function synergistically with said function performed by said personal digital assistant.

Claims 15, 17-19 and 23-24 depend upon independent Claim 13, as amended herein. These dependent claims incorporate each and every one of the elements of the corresponding independent claim on which they depend.

Ditzik in combination with Chang does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation of “a device comprising: circuitry for coupling .... wherein said device is sized and shaped to serve as a cover for an expansion card port, wherein said device fits into an opening in a housing of said personal digital assistant, wherein said device resides within the volume of said housing ....”. Rather, Ditzik teaches a cover for a notebook computer. Specifically, Ditzik fails to teach or suggest an

opening or an expansion card within a housing or a cover. Although Ditzik does teach a housing in Figures 9 and 16, the housing as taught by Ditzik never describes nor suggests a cover for an opening in the housing. Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claims 1, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as not being anticipated by Chang. Therefore, the combination of Chang and Ditzik fails to teach or suggest the claim language cited above.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Chang and Ditzik does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 15, 17-19, and 23-24.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over CChang in view of Ikenouchi, et. al. (US Patent No. 5,835,863). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully conclude that the present invention as recited in Claims 20-21 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Chang in view of Ikenouchi, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Chang in view of Ikenouchi.

Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e). Applicants thus respectfully re-assert that, as amended herein, Claim 13 incorporates subject matter including a device comprising circuitry for coupling said device to a personal digital assistant, and circuitry for performing a function synergistically with a function performed by said personal digital assistant; wherein said device is sized and shaped to serve as a cover for an expansion card

port, wherein said device fits into an opening in a housing of said personal digital assistant, wherein said device resides within the volume of said housing and performs a first function of enclosing said opening and performs a second function synergistically with said function performed by said personal digital assistant.

Claims 20 and 21 depend upon independent Claim 13, as amended herein and recite additional features of the present claimed invention. These dependent claims incorporate each and every one of the elements of the corresponding independent claims on which they depend.

Ikenouchi in combination with Chang does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation of “a device comprising: circuitry for coupling .... wherein said device is sized and shaped to serve as a cover for an expansion card port, wherein said device fits into an opening in a housing of said personal digital assistant, wherein said device resides within the volume of said housing ....” Rather, Ikenouchi teaches a wireless telephone that illuminates and vibrates. Specifically, Ikenouchi fails to teach or suggest a housing, an opening, a cover or an expansion card within a housing. Applicants respectfully re-assert each and every point argued above regarding the rejections of independent Claims 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as not being anticipated by Chang. Therefore, the combination of Chang and Ikenouchi fails to teach or suggest the claim language cited above.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Chang and Ikenouchi does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 20-21.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 13-21 and 23-24 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of these Claims is respectfully solicited.

Applicants further point out that no contested Claims remain in the present Application.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 9/19/2003

  
Anthony C. Murabito  
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060